

Appl. No.: 09/832,884
Amdt. Dated: November 10, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: September 10, 2003

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the outstanding Office Action beginning at page 2 thereof. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments in the claims and these remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Applicant has now amended claim 1 to consistently refer to the known good die as the "KGD". This change has been made throughout the claim in order to distinguish the know good die from the known good die test which is still written in words.

The claim has been amended to include structure. The Examiner has objected to the word "optional connections" in claim 1. In response, Applicant has deleted the word "optional" and instead has claimed each of the connections, namely the solder ball array connections and wire bond connections. In claim 1 as amended, the KGD has electrical connections between all of the solder ball array connections and the wire bond connections.

The structure claimed is both solder ball array and wire bond connections. Applicant claims testing by wire bond or in the alternative by solder ball. When either alternative is completed during the test of the dye to determine if it is a KGD, then one of the two possibilities of a KGD will occur.

Appl. No.: 09/832,884
Amdt. Dated: November 10, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: September 10, 2003

As the prior art shows, KGD is a term used to define a dye after testing. Testing is used to define the product in this art. The device, therefore, is a KGD where it has been tested for KGD purposes.

In claim 5, the Examiner questions the term "not removed". Applicant respectfully traverses this observation because the non-connections referred to in the dependent claim 5 are those which are those used during the test (proof of KGD). These are not removed from the dye. This is also consistent with claim 1 as amended which states that the KGD has solder ball array and an array of wire bond connections.

In claim 2, Applicant has deleted the term "stress tolerant".

Interpretation of Claim Structure

Claims 1 and 2 have now been amended to overcome any ambiguity as to interpretation of claim structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 1 - 6 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 10-135281 as applied at page 4 of the previous Office Action is respectfully traversed even though the claim has been substantially amended in order to make it clearer and to deal with § 112 rejections. The Examiner has failed to note that in '281, reference numeral (1) refers to the IC chip. The IC chip has

Appl. No.: 09/832,884
Amdt. Dated: November 10, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: September 10, 2003

a single electrode pad (2) There is no solder ball on the chip. Instead, there are pewter bumps (solder balls (23)) located on another separate substrate (21) which lies on top of the chip. The chip, as is well known in the art, is the dye. The chip in '281 simply does not have solder ball array connections on a planar surface. Applicant's specification, on the other hand, states that both the wire bond connections and the solder ball connections are on such a planar connection as shown in Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that Applicant's claimed known good dye is simply not anticipated for the above reasons. However, claim 1 still further requires that there be electrical connections between all the solder ball array connections and the wire bond connections. This is an important feature of Applicant's invention because it allows testing by either. Such a simple arrangement was shown in Applicant's Figures 1B, 2, and 3. Since there are no solder ball array connections on the known good dye of '281, it is impossible for this device to have electrical connections between the solder ball array connections and the wire connections as claimed. Here the Examiner should note that the claim must be read as a whole and the ball array connections and the wire bond connections are specifically to be on the KGD planar surface.


US Patent 5,517,127

Appl. No.: 09/832,884
Amdt. Dated: November 10, 2003
Reply to Office Action of: September 10, 2003

Although the Examiner has not cited the '127 patent, Applicant wishes again to bring this reference to the Examiner's attention. This reference is clearly distinguished from Applicant's amended claims for the reasons set forth in Applicant's specification beginning at page 4, line 17 and continuing through the bottom of page 6.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and early action in accordance thereof is requested. In the event there is any reason why the application cannot be allowed in this current condition, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the number listed below to resolve any problems by Interview or Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald R. Snider
Reg. No. 24,962

Date: November 10, 2003

Snider & Associates
Ronald R. Snider
P.O. Box 27613
Washington, D.C. 20038-7613
(202) 347-2600

RRS/bam